

identifying data deleted to
prevent clearly unwarranted
invasion of personal privacy

PUBLIC COPY

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services
Office of Administrative Appeals
20 Massachusetts Ave. N.W. MS 2090
Washington, D.C. 20529-2090
U.S. Citizenship
and Immigration
Services



tlb

DATE: OFFICE: MEXICO CITY, MEXICO

APR 24 2012

IN RE: Applicant:

APPLICATION: Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Immigration and Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v)

ON BEHALF OF APPLICANT:

SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

Enclosed please find the decision of the Administrative Appeals Office in your case. All of the documents related to this matter have been returned to the office that originally decided your case. Please be advised that any further inquiry that you might have concerning your case must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied by us in reaching our decision, or you have additional information that you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reconsider or a motion to reopen. The specific requirements for filing such a request can be found at 8 C.F.R. § 103.5. All motions must be submitted to the office that originally decided your case by filing a Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal or Motion, with a fee of \$630. Please be aware that 8 C.F.R. § 103.5(a)(1)(i) requires that any motion must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider or reopen.

Thank you,

Petty Rhew
Chief, Administrative Appeals Office

DISCUSSION: The waiver application was denied by the Field Office Director, Mexico City, Mexico, and is now before the Administrative Appeals Office (AAO) on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The record reflects that the applicant is a native and citizen of Mexico who was found to be inadmissible to the United States pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(i), for having been unlawfully present in the United States for more than one year and seeking admission within 10 years of his last departure from the United States. The applicant is the spouse of a U.S. Citizen and is the beneficiary of an approved Petition for Alien Relative (Form I-130). The applicant, through his spouse, does not contest this finding of inadmissibility. Rather, he seeks a waiver of inadmissibility pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1182(a)(9)(B)(v), in order to reside with his wife and child in the United States.

The Field Office Director concluded that the applicant failed to establish that extreme hardship would be imposed on a qualifying relative and denied the Application for Waiver of Grounds of Inadmissibility (Form I-601) accordingly. *See Decision of Field Office Director*, dated February 5, 2010.

On appeal, the applicant's spouse asserts that the evidentiary documentation demonstrates that since the applicant left the United States because of his inadmissibility, she has been suffering extreme economic and medical hardship because she has been living on one income; has defaulted on several accounts; likely will have a lien placed on her vehicle; does not have public transportation to get to work; has recently been diagnosed with diabetes; has difficulty caring for her five year old child because of her health condition; and has employment-related issues because she needs to take time off to attend her medical appointments. *See Form I-290B, Notice of Appeal*, dated March 3, 2010.

The record includes, but is not limited to: letters from the applicant's spouse; identity, financial, employment, and medical documents; and country conditions information. The entire record was reviewed and considered in rendering a decision on the appeal.

Section 212(a)(9) of the Act provides, in pertinent part:

(B) ALIENS UNLAWFULLY PRESENT.-

(i) In General.- Any alien (other than an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence) who-

...

(II) has been unlawfully present in the United States for one year or more, and who again seeks admission within 10 years of the date of such alien's departure or removal from the United States, is inadmissible.

...

(v) Waiver.-The Attorney General [now the Secretary of Homeland Security (Secretary)] has sole discretion to waive clause (i) in the case of an immigrant who is the spouse or son or daughter of a United States citizen or of an alien lawfully admitted for permanent residence, if it is established to the satisfaction of the Attorney General [Secretary] that the refusal of admission to such immigrant alien would result in extreme hardship to the citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of such alien. No court shall have jurisdiction to review a decision or action by the Attorney General [Secretary] regarding a waiver under this clause.

The record establishes that the applicant entered the United States without inspection by U.S. immigration officials in or around May 2002 and remained until November 2008, when he voluntarily departed to Mexico. The applicant accrued unlawful presence from May 2002 until November 2008, a period in excess of one year. As the applicant is seeking admission within 10 years of departure, he is inadmissible pursuant to section 212(a)(9)(B)(i)(II) of the Act.

A waiver of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act is dependent on a showing that the bar to admission imposes extreme hardship on a qualifying relative, which includes the U.S. citizen or lawfully resident spouse or parent of the applicant. Hardship to the applicant or the applicant's child can be considered only insofar as it results in hardship to a qualifying relative. The applicant's wife is the only qualifying relative in this case. If extreme hardship to a qualifying relative is established, the applicant is statutorily eligible for a waiver, and USCIS then assesses whether a favorable exercise of discretion is warranted. *See Matter of Mendez-Morales*, 21 I&N Dec. 296, 301 (BIA 1996).

Extreme hardship is "not a definable term of fixed and inflexible content or meaning," but "necessarily depends upon the facts and circumstances peculiar to each case." *Matter of Hwang*, 10 I&N Dec. 448, 451 (BIA 1964). In *Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, the Board provided a list of factors it deemed relevant in determining whether an alien has established extreme hardship to a qualifying relative. 22 I&N Dec. 560, 565 (BIA 1999). The factors include the presence of a lawful permanent resident or United States citizen spouse or parent in this country; the qualifying relative's family ties outside the United States; the conditions in the country or countries to which the qualifying relative would relocate and the extent of the qualifying relative's ties in such countries; the financial impact of departure from this country; and significant conditions of health, particularly when tied to an unavailability of suitable medical care in the country to which the qualifying relative would relocate. *Id.* The Board added that not all of the foregoing factors need be analyzed in any given case and emphasized that the list of factors was not exclusive. *Id.* at 566.

The Board has also held that the common or typical results of removal and inadmissibility do not constitute extreme hardship, and has listed certain individual hardship factors considered common rather than extreme. These factors include: economic disadvantage, loss of current employment, inability to maintain one's present standard of living, inability to pursue a chosen profession, separation from family members, severing community ties, cultural readjustment after living in the United States for many years, cultural adjustment of qualifying relatives who have never lived outside the United States, inferior economic and educational opportunities in the foreign country, or inferior medical facilities in the foreign country. *See generally Matter of Cervantes-Gonzalez*, 22 I&N Dec. at 568; *Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996); *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 883 (BIA 1994); *Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. 245, 246-47 (Comm'r 1984); *Matter of Kim*, 15 I&N Dec. 88, 89-90 (BIA 1974); *Matter of Shaughnessy*, 12 I&N Dec. 810, 813 (BIA 1968).

However, though hardships may not be extreme when considered abstractly or individually, the Board has made it clear that "[r]elevant factors, though not extreme in themselves, must be considered in the aggregate in determining whether extreme hardship exists." *Matter of O-J-O*, 21 I&N Dec. 381, 383 (BIA 1996) (quoting *Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. at 882). The adjudicator "must consider the entire range of factors concerning hardship in their totality and determine whether the combination of hardships takes the case beyond those hardships ordinarily associated with deportation." *Id.*

The actual hardship associated with an abstract hardship factor such as family separation, economic disadvantage, cultural readjustment, et cetera, differs in nature and severity depending on the unique circumstances of each case, as does the cumulative hardship a qualifying relative experiences as a result of aggregated individual hardships. *See, e.g., Matter of Bing Chih Kao and Mei Tsui Lin*, 23 I&N Dec. 45, 51 (BIA 2001) (distinguishing *Matter of Pilch* regarding hardship faced by qualifying relatives on the basis of variations in the length of residence in the United States and the ability to speak the language of the country to which they would relocate). For example, though family separation has been found to be a common result of inadmissibility or removal, separation from family living in the United States can also be the most important single hardship factor in considering hardship in the aggregate. *See Salcido-Salcido*, 138 F.3d at 1293 (quoting *Contreras-Buenfil v. INS*, 712 F.2d 401, 403 (9th Cir. 1983)); *but see Matter of Ngai*, 19 I&N Dec. at 247 (separation of spouse and children from applicant not extreme hardship due to conflicting evidence in the record and because applicant and spouse had been voluntarily separated from one another for 28 years). Therefore, we consider the totality of the circumstances in determining whether denial of admission would result in extreme hardship to a qualifying relative.

The applicant's spouse contends that she has suffered extreme financial and medical hardship as a result of separation from the applicant because without the applicant's financial support, she has been unable to pay the debt for several accounts, and consequently, those accounts have gone into collection; she has been under a huge burden and has been affected personally as she has been unable to concentrate at her job, resulting in employment-related counseling; she has been diagnosed with diabetes, and has missed work or been late to work because of her physical

condition, resulting in probation at her job; and her son continues to ask for the applicant on a daily basis and has to grow-up without the applicant's presence.

The evidence on the record is sufficient to establish that the applicant's spouse has been experiencing some financial difficulty and may experience some hardship in the applicant's absence from the United States. However, the record does not establish that the hardship that the spouse may experience goes beyond what is normally experienced by qualified family members of inadmissible individuals. The AAO notes that the spouse has been delinquent for credit card and mobile telephone accounts, but the record does not include any specific evidence of the spouse's earnings and income or her financial obligations. Rather, the record only includes a general statement that the spouse makes about \$20,000/year.

Additionally, the AAO finds that the record establishes that the spouse is being treated for Diabetes Mellitus 2 (uncontrolled) and has been diagnosed with Hyperlipidemia and may experience some hardship in the applicant's absence because of these medical conditions. The record does not include any evidence that the applicant's presence in the United States is necessary in the treatment of the spouse's medical conditions or that the spouse is unable to function in the applicant's absence. Rather, the record only contains general care instructions for an individual diagnosed with diabetes. Moreover, the AAO notes that the spouse has been reprimanded at work due to performance-related issues. However, the record does not specifically demonstrate that the performance issues are directly related to the applicant's absence. As such And, the record does not include any evidence of the spouse's mental health or her inability to function in the applicant's absence.

The AAO notes the concerns regarding the applicant's spouse's financial obligations and medical conditions in rearing a child without the other parent's assistance, but finds that even when this hardship is considered in the aggregate, the record fails to establish that the applicant's spouse would suffer extreme hardship as a result of separation from the applicant.

The applicant's spouse also contends that she would suffer extreme hardship upon relocating to Mexico to be with the applicant because she and the applicant's potential earnings would be significantly less and place them below the poverty line; she and their son would miss out on the opportunity of pursuing their education and furthering their careers; her son also would not be fluent in English and she would not have the money to send him to school to learn English; she has always resided in the United States as a citizen; all of her family ties are in the United States, and she does not have any personal ties to Mexico; and there is unsuitable healthcare, especially if her son suffered an asthma attack.

The record is sufficient to establish that the spouse is a U.S. citizen who has never lived outside the United States. She does not have any social or economic ties to Mexico. The record establishes that her parents, siblings, and extended family members also live in the United States. Considering the hardships asserted by the applicant's spouse, including her strong family and social ties in the United States, her lack of ties to Mexico, her physical health condition and the

need for ongoing treatment, considered along with the normal hardships associated with relocation, the AAO finds that the applicant's spouse would experience extreme hardship.

We can find extreme hardship warranting a waiver of inadmissibility only where an applicant has demonstrated extreme hardship to a qualifying relative in the scenario of separation *and* the scenario of relocation. A claim that a qualifying relative will relocate and thereby suffer extreme hardship can easily be made for purposes of the waiver even where there is no actual intention to relocate. *Cf. Matter of Ige*, 20 I&N Dec. 880, 886 (BIA 1994). Furthermore, to relocate and suffer extreme hardship, where remaining in the United States and being separated from the applicant would not result in extreme hardship, is a matter of choice and not the result of inadmissibility. *Id.*, also *cf. Matter of Pilch*, 21 I&N Dec. 627, 632-33 (BIA 1996). As the applicant has not demonstrated extreme hardship from separation, we cannot find that refusal of admission would result in extreme hardship to the qualifying relative(s) in this case.

In this case, the record does not contain sufficient evidence to show that the hardship faced by the qualifying relative, considered in the aggregate, rises beyond the common results of removal or inadmissibility to the level of extreme hardship. The AAO therefore finds that the applicant has failed to establish extreme hardship to his United States Citizen spouse as required under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act. As the applicant has not established extreme hardship to a qualifying family member, no purpose would be served in determining whether the applicant merits a waiver as a matter of discretion.

In proceedings for application for waiver of grounds of inadmissibility under section 212(a)(9)(B)(v) of the Act, the burden of proving eligibility remains entirely with the applicant. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. § 1361. Here, the applicant has not met that burden. Accordingly, the appeal will be dismissed.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.